



AF
aw

PTO/SB/21 (01-08)

Approved for use through 02/29/2008. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

25

Application Number	09/964,000
Filing Date	09/26/2001
First Named Inventor	Guess, William Y
Art Unit	1761
Examiner Name	Becker, Drew
Attorney Docket Number	

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement

<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 | <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers
<input type="checkbox"/> Petition
<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation
<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address
<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer
<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund
<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD | <input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC
<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): |
|--|--|---|

Remarks

Fees have previously been paid for the Notice and Brief

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name

Signature

William Y. Guess

Printed name

William Y. Guess

Date

02/05/2008

Reg. No.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature

Typed or printed name

William Y. Guess

Date

02/05/2008

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No. : 09/964,000 Confirmation No. 3019
Applicant : William Y. Guess
Filed : 09/26/2001
TC/A.U. : ~~1761~~ 1794
Examiner : Becker, Drew

Appeal Brief

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Va 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant respectfully submits the following Supplemental Appeal Brief.

This brief is filed in response to the communication mailed 01/14/2008. Fees have previously been paid.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.

The real party in interest is the appellant, William Y. Guess.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.

There are presently no appeals or interferences known to the appellant.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS.

Claims 1 through 21 (cancelled)

Claims 22 through 46 stand rejected and are appealed herewith.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.

No amendments have been filed subsequent to the final office action.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.

The invention described in the instant application relates to a coaxially combined meat roast in which a tenderloin, 14 is disposed along the longitudinal axis of the corresponding top loin, 12 thereof¹. These muscle based meats are taken from a bisected loin or short loin. The short loin is that part of the carcass of a food animal between the hips and the ribs². The tenderloin consists of three muscles, the most prominent being the psoas major. A beef filet mignon consists of only the psoas major after having the

¹ Abstract; Fig. 9 Specification, paragraph 32

² Fig. 3, Specification, paragraph 27

psoas minor removed. When taken from beef cattle, the psoas minor is often called the “chain” because of the resemblance thereto. The top loin is comprised of almost entirely of the muscle longissimus dorsi. When sliced into steaks, the top loin of beef is commonly called a New York or Kansas City Strip or simply a strip steak.

When the short loin is sliced with the bone in, these steaks are referred to as T Bone or Porterhouse steaks with beef and loin chops if not beef.

Still referring to the coaxially combined roast the description teaches a method of wrapping the tenderloin, prior to insertion, with blanched greens, 18 in order to highlight the boundary between the constituent parts³. Diners are known to appreciate these type concentric arrangements with sushi, various deserts and the like. Appellant claims this element as a “means for highlighting” the boundary between the inner and outer constituent as allowed by the sixth paragraph of Section 112 of Title 35.

Within the instant specification on page 6, paragraph 33 there is taught a method for inverting the tip of certain muscles into themselves, 26, 28 after having been removed therefrom. These muscles stated are the psoas major and the longissimus dorsi. Figures 11 and 12 show this combination.

³ Abstract, Fig. 6, Fig. 1, 2a, 2b; Specification paragraph 30, 31 lines 9 and 10.

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.

[not required pursuant to CFR 37 § 41.37 (c)(1)]

VII. ARGUMENT

The written description requirement⁴ rejections.

The examiner has not presented, much less established, a *prima facie* case toward any of appellant's claims regarding the written description requirement of Section 112, which must be approached by a case by case analysis. No evidentiary analysis is provided in the final office action toward any of the WDR rejections.

Regarding claims 22 in which the edible filling is said to be comprised of "an animal tissue elongate having a dominant proportion of water and protein respectively". From the standard reference: The Meat We Eat: "Lean muscle consists of approximately 20% protein, 70% water, 9% fat, and 1% ash."⁵

Claim 27 which depends from claim 22 further limits the edible filling to a tenderloin, this is wholly consistent with the originally filed claims. If a food animal tenderloin did not contain a dominant proportion of water and protein, only a Section 112 second paragraph rejection would be in order as this

⁴ Also referred to as the WDR

⁵ The Meat We Eat, eleventh edition. 1977, The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc Danville, Illinois, page 627. This book is commonly referred to as the meat science "Bible" and remains in print today (14th edition).

language would not narrow the independent claim from which it depends. This should only magnify the error of the WDR rejection regarding Claim 22 as well as the other WDR rejections by reading them from bottom to top, from the dependent claims to the independent. Most of the dependent claims are completely consistent with the originally filed claims to which they most resemble.

Claim 27 reads:

27. The food item of claim 26 wherein said edible filling is comprised of a length of tenderloin.

In the Office Action the examiner does not take exception to the words “edible filling” as being ad odds with the written description requirement of Section 112, nor should he. Claim 27 limits the edible filling to that of a “length of tenderloin”. This language is completely consistent with the originally filed specification. Relative to this or any claims descending from claim 22 and including claim 22, the examiner is burdened to show that a length of tenderloin, as taught in the specification, does not contain a “dominant proportion of water and protein” in order to establish a *prima facie* finding relative to the written description requirement of Title 35 Section 112 first paragraph.

The description clearly and reasonably shows possession at the time of the filing toward Claim 30 with regard to the WDR.

Claim 30 states that the second animal tissue elongate has a weight at least 7% as that of the outer tubular perform which is described in the specification as a top loin and the second animal tissue elongate as the associated tenderloin thereof.

Knives and scales are indispensable equipment for traditional butchers. Possession of the claimed subject matter at the time of the filing would be absolute and irrefutable to skilled butchers. The tenderloin of a typical four legged, fur bearing food animal is roughly 50% the weight of the respective top loin thereof when both are taken from a short loin. For instance, when taken from the same short loin of beef, a typical tenderloin will weight approximately 6 pounds and the respective top loin will weight 9 pounds. Appellant is prepared to provide published proof in response to any answer to the contrary with regard to these relative weights.

Appellant would like to note for the record that absent an upper limit toward the weight proportion of the filling meat item toward that of the outer meat item does not render these claims indistinct in that 100% inherently provides the upper limit relative to the weight ratios. See *Halliburton Energy Syvc. V. M-I*. CAFC 2007-1149 Jan. 25, 2008. The court states in footnote 5:

Of course, a claim may contain a limitation that includes no explicit upper bound at all (e.g., a claim limitation that requires “at least 5%” of an element). Since such a limitation does not contemplate an upper

bound beyond what is practically required (e.g., the total percentage must be less than 100%).

A proportion of the filling meat item to the outer, would be attainable depending on the weights and starting geometries of the selected constituents.

Also, for the reasons stated above, the rejection of dependent claim 35 is error.

Rejection of those claims including the language “means for highlighting” is error.

The examiner has not presented nor established a *prima facie* case regarding failure of the instant application to satisfy the written description requirement of Section 112 first paragraph toward any claims containing the language, “means for highlighting”. The description, drawings and color photographs entered and accepted by petition and fee, clearly show possession of the claimed subject matter described at the time of filing. These color photographs do not contain new matter, nor were they rejected as such.

Regarding the “non-pork” language of Claim 40 lacking a written description in the specification.

Appellant’s description is not specifically limited to pork meat and only if it were, would this rejection be proper. The specification describes the problems associated with lamb and beef short loins. The color photographs do not show sliced sections of coaxially combined pork, they do show those of lamb and beef, and while these photographs were added subsequent to the

filing of the description they contain no new matter. If the specification limited the subject matter to exclude all meats types of than pork, a new matter rejection should have been made by the examiner, none was made. The animal carcass shown in profile in appellant's drawing is that of a lamb and not that of a pig and no skilled butcher would ever confuse the two. The WDR rejections of Claim 40 and those depending therefrom are error.

Regarding Claims 22 being indefinite pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph.

The language of claim 22 is clear and distinct and particularly points out the common knowledge that meat is comprised of substantially 70 percent water and 20 percent protein respectively, a dominant proportion by any measure. Animal fat tissue, such as pork fat back which consists primarily of fatty acids, and especially cured fat products such as salt pork, have 25 or less percentage of water and very, very little protein. Larded beef, an almost extinct product, contains multiple strips of fat along the longitudinal interior, when viewed in light of larded beef, appellant's claim is done so with clear particularity. This rejection is error.

In paragraph 5 of the instant Office Action the examiner states:

Claim 22 recites "a dominant proportion of water and protein". It is not clear what level of protein and water would be considered "dominant".

Yet in paragraph 17 of the instant Office Action the examiner states the obvious:

Furthermore, a “dominant proportion” could alternatively be defined as meaning simply greater than half.

Up until this brief, appellant did not offer a definition of “dominant proportion” nor did he offer a definition of “edible filling” which is found nowhere in the specification. The examiner correctly provides the answer as to “dominant proportion”, as would the artesian. The artesian would appreciate, duplicating the examiners *own* analysis, that the appellant had possession of the claimed subject matter at the time of filing. Animal muscle tissue is comprised primarily of 4 chemical and biochemical constituents, water, protein, fat and ash, with water and protein dominating.

Claims 24 and 31 are distinct.

The instant application teaches, *inter alia*, wrapping red meat with a green leafy material, then inserting this enrobed red meat elongate into the interior of another red meat elongate. The green leaf highlights the boundary thereinbetween, clearly providing structure relative to the means plus function element. The examiner states with regards to “means for highlighting” the boundary, “It is not clear what component this refers to.” Appellant does not believe the artesian, nor would the public, have any problem ascertaining the correlation of this component of the coaxially combined meat item with regards to claim 31 and those which include this limitation. Transitioning from the core meat to the outer meat absent the leafy wrap does not perform the claimed “means for highlighting” function, regardless of the examiners comments that they do. Sushi rolls commonly use nori, a jet black seaweed analog sheet and sticky white rice

along with various other components in their construction. Often the nori is laid onto a bamboo mat, the rice placed thereon and other fillings placed onto the leading edge of the rice, the whole is rolled up. Occasionally, in order to provide an even more distinctive appearance for the diner, the rice is spread first on the bamboo mat, then the nori, then the various fillings. When sliced transversely the nori ring highlights the boundary between the rice and the, for example, ersatz snow crab meat, avocado, or whatever. And while the diner's close inspection could ascertain the transition, and even the boundary, between these food stuffs absent the nori ring, the result would not be nearly as dramatic or "highlighted". These rejections are error.

With regard to claims 22-23, 30-31, 35-36, 40-41, and 44-45 being anticipated by the Lovell disclosure.

Appellant respectfully disagrees. The Lovell patent does not disclose an animal tissue elongate disposed within the de-boned chicken leg quarter. It shows and teaches viscous stuffing and nothing else. Also the transition from the stuffing to the outer chicken leg does not perform the function as recited in those claims of the appellant's that provide a "means for highlighting" limitation.

The respective weight relationships between the stuffing and the leg quarter meat as shown by the Lovell disclosure's drawing figures would be irrelevant toward anticipation, as the stuffing would not be equivalent to, nor be read on by applicants coaxially centered animal tissue elongate limitation.

The Lovell disclosure teaches a method for the removal of the leg and thigh bones of a poultry leg quarter and then stuffing the cavity produced thereby with

“viscous material”. It is neither described nor suggested within the Lovell disclosure that an animal tissue elongate be substituted for the viscous stuffing. The Lovell disclosure clearly fails to enable the artisan sufficient to position an animal tissue elongate to the nether reaches of the boned out cavity of the chicken leg quarter. And while the transition between the leg tissues and the viscous stuffing would be discernable, again, this transition would not perform the function of the presently asserted “highlighting” means-plus-function claim element in and of itself. The Lovell disclosure teaches a food item comprising 2 elements: chicken leg and stuffing. Even if the stuffing were comprised entirely of cooked spinach making for a drastic transition, the boundary between these constituents would not be “highlighted”. A stark transition does not equate to a “highlighted boundary”, equivalency must be found relative to those elements which the examiner considers to anticipate. Each and every element of the asserted claims must be present in the single prior art disclosure in order to anticipate a claim. Appellant does not find anticipation with regard to the Lovell disclosure as it relates to any of appellant’s claims. These rejections are error.

Claims 22, 24 and 30-31, 40-41 and 44-45 have been rejected as being anticipated by U.S. 6,599,545 issued to Holbrook.

Appellant respectfully disagrees. In order to anticipate any claim, each and every claim limitation must be found in a single prior art reference. Such is not the case with the Holbrook patent. There is not shown, taught or suggested a tubular preform comprised of meat or any other animal tissue, within the Holbrook disclosure. The Holbrook disclosure teaches the coring of a loaf of bread and inserting arcuately arranged sandwich fixings thereinto. Appellant is unaware of any device or method for “coring” a meat elongate. However, if such a device

were known, this could provide an excellent way to produce appellant's claimed subject matter, by: coring a meat elongate such as a length of beef rib eye, removing the central plug from whatever device used, then returning this plug to the original location thereof. These 102 rejections are error.

The examiner, in the instant Office Action, refers to column 3 line 14 , intimating that meat should be considered a foodstuff for the purpose of providing a suitable casing for the Holbrook sandwich. The sentence in question also refers to lettuce and condiments as being "foodstuff". No enablement is provided toward the coring of meat anymore than that of a leaf of lettuce or an quantity of mustard. Claim elements enjoy a presumption of, *inter alia*, enablement; vague statements within the specification, do not. The paragraph containing the above reference from the Holbrook description describes "filler-type foodstuff" and "shell type foodstuff". These two groups are lumped together as being "foodstuff". The examiner using hindsight may not import a single item relegated as a filler-type foodstuff into the shell-type list.

Further, the examiner states that figure 6, #50 shows a "boundary means". Rather, element 50 is described as a sheet of plastic and while being described as "food grade" is presumably inedible.

Claim 31 and 35-36 have been rejected as being anticipated by U.S. 6,582,741 issued to Haig.

The Haig disclosure teaches a device and method for incising a pork loin along the longitudinal axis thereof and inserting a viscous mass by use of a tube incased ram. Nowhere in the Haig disclosure is there any teaching or suggestion that an

animal tissue elongate be inserted by this device (or method) into the incised pork loin. With regard to Claim 31, Haig teaches a two part food item, a filling and an outer solid meat tubular perform therearound, as with claim 31. Claim 31 adds the limitation “means for highlighting” the boundary between these elements. There is art of record that teaches a three part coaxial meat item. Citation AD which was part of the original non provisional filing contains this, inherent three part coaxial meat item. This non patent prior art by the National Pork Board teaches inserting a link sausage into and along the longitudinal axis of a pork loin. Link sausage is a meat stuffing within a tubular preform namely, sausage casing.

However sausage casing would not perform the “means for highlighting” function of Claim 31 in that sausage casing is very thin and virtually transparent. Nothing demonstrates the transparency of sausage casing quite like the sight of a platter holding both *boudin blanc* and *boudin noir*⁶. *Boudin blanc*, typically made from veal or chicken and pure white fat, is usually as white as vanilla ice cream, and *boudin noir* (made mostly from beef, lamb or pork blood) is often nearly as black as tar. Both sausages are made using the same casing material.

Claims 22, 24, and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haig in view of Huling.

Patents issued to Haig (U.S. 6,582,741) and Huling (U.S. 6,117,467) teach similar devices namely a plunger system for stuffing viscous material into pork

⁶ <http://pageperso.aol.fr/pigachoux/page18.html> The bottom of this web page shows an excellent photograph of both these French sausages.

loins, with the Haig disclosure and various edibles with the Huling disclosure. Combined, these disclosures do not teach, disclose or suggest, nor is there present, when combined, the subject matter of appellant's asserted claims. Nowhere in either of these disclosures is there taught or suggested that an animal tissue elongate be inserted into a tubular preform comprised of meat. The material to be stuffed regarding the Huling disclosure is vague. For instance in line 25 under the paragraph headed by "Related Art" the following passage appears:

Other materials may also be used for stuffing, such as vegetables (onions, garlic and the like), And other meats (sausage mix stuffed into a roast, or crawfish or crab meat stuffed into other meats).

The Huling disclosure does not teach, disclose, or suggest that lengths of animal tissue be used to fill the available incision no more than it teaches or suggests that whole, raw, unpeeled onions be loaded into the device and stuffed into a meat item, despite the vague language. The words vegetables and meats are used to indicate the type of material used in viscous stuffing; nothing else is taught nor suggested. Also the drawings of the Huling disclosure bear this out. The Huling disclosure does not repair the deficiencies of the Haig disclosure's teachings with regard to applicants above asserted, rejected claims. Even absent motivation to combine case law, these rejections are error.

Claims 26-29 and 42-43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Haig, in view of Holbrook, and further in view of Giuliano Bugialli's Techniques of Italian Cooking.

The Haig disclosure does not show, teach or suggest an incision of sufficient dimension to receive the pork loin's respective tenderloin, therefore even the

combined references do not disclose the combination of appellant's asserted claims absent appellant's disclosure in which particular attention was paid to the incision required for the instant invention claimed by the appellant.

Appellant is unable to ascertain any motivation for a person having ordinary skill in the art of butchery to combine these disclosures, absent applicants disclosure. The Holbrook patent teaches a hand held sandwich type food item containing an arcuate arrangement of cold cuts and sandwich fixings, with no motivation contained therein to combine the teachings thereof with those of Haig or any of the other meat roast disclosures cited in these rejections. On Column 2 line 30, Haig suggests that the device may be used to "stuff" a loaf of bread. No reciprocal language may be found in Holbrook regarding meat.

Additionally, appellant asserts that the prior art relating to the combination of the top loin with the tenderloin point decidedly toward secondary conditions of patentability as provided by *Graham v. John Deer*, in that combining the top loin with the tenderloin have been, and continue to be, performed by a variety of complicated, time consuming procedures requiring a great deal of expertise and effort which result in a product having much less visual or dining appeal than that taught by applicants disclosure.

Even using impermissible hindsight, the only way of producing appellants claimed invention involving a solid meat center from any of the analogous prior art disclosures relating to this appeal, would be to insert a lamb tenderloin (from AAPA) into the incised pork loin of Haig. The incision shown in the Haig disclosure is not of sufficient dimension to receive the respective tenderloin thereof. These rejections are error.

Claims 23 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haig, in view of Huling and further in view of Giuliano Bugialli's Techniques of Italian Cooking.

Appellant is unable to ascertain any suggestion or motivation for a person having ordinary skill in the art of butchery to combine these references, absent applicant's disclosure with regard to appellants claimed subject matter. The Bugialli disclosure does not show the raw meat item sliced into steaks. The instructions to slice the roast follow those for cooking it. Upon being cooked, the veal tissues become fixed and firm due to the coagulation of the tissue-based proteins as well as the natural constriction due to the cooking. The Bugialli disclosed rolled roast would not provide acceptable steaks when sliced raw absent the shown binding. The meat products shown by Haig and Huling would not be suitable for slicing and grilling as the viscous filling would become dislodged during cooking, turning and transport, especially when cooked on a grill.

Veal tenderloins have a larger cross section diameter than pork tenderloins and no matter the incision, could not fit, absent trimming, into a pork loin. These rejections are error.

Appellant's disclosure involves the discovery that the tenderloin taken from the short loin of a food animal will fit longitudinally into the respective top loin thereof, if careful steps are taken as shown in appellant's specification.

Appellant's disclosure solves a centuries-old long felt need toward the art of butchery. "Boned and rolled" short loins may be ordered from butcher shops

today, and as described in the background section of applicant's disclosure, these roasts contain the boneless top loin, the boneless tenderloin, the "skirt" wrapper and unavoidably contain a large proportion of gristle and fat. The boned and rolled roast is that which is described in the Bugialli instructions as well as that of the Beverly Cox cooking technique book excerpt. These gnarly roasts do not approach the visual appeal of applicants disclosed coaxial roast when cooked and sliced, nor the simplicity of construction, versatility and convenience of use. Applicant requested that Graham considerations be regarded toward the asserted, pertinent claims. The examiner has never responded to that request.

Claims 32-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haig in view of Bemis (U.S. Patent number 1,807,189).

These disclosures are non analogous. The Haig patent describes a raw food product intended for cooking. The Bemis patent teaches a hand held, ready to eat, sandwich-type food item. The examiner has not established a *prima facie* finding of obviousness toward the combination of these references in that no motivation to combine is present within either of these disclosures toward the other relative to a meat item. Even, for the sake of argument, what item would be provided: a raw cookable meat item containing lettuce, pickles, cheese, cold cuts and condiments?

Claims 37-39 and 46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haig, in view of Huling, in further view of Bemis.

Appellant insists that the Bemis patent is not analogous to either the Haig or Huling patent with regards to filling a meat item. There is no motivation provided in the above disclosures toward the combination thereof relative to a

meat roast, and as such, no *prima facie* finding of obviousness has been established by the examiner. How could the Bemis patent suggest to a butcher that he or she insert sandwich fixings into the meat item of Haig or Huling?

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, appellant submits that each and every rejection was done so erroneously. Further, appellant is unable to ascertain a single established *prima facie* case toward any rejection. Appellant has nonetheless, argued as though burdened to do so in response to the various grounds of rejection. Also, due to the sheer number and variety of rejections, appellant will entrust to this honorable board the task of grouping.

As stated by what is commonly referred to as “boilerplate”, though in appellant’s opinion these words remain as important today as when they were first crafted, the instant specification is provided as an example and should not be considered as limiting.

The examiner bears the burden of providing evidence that claim elements are not supported by the instant specification relative to the written description requirement of Section 112 first paragraph.

The reversal of all the rejections appears to be in order and is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William Y. Guess

February 5, 2008

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX.

Listing of Claims:

Claims 1 through 21 (cancelled)

22. (previously presented) In a food item of the type in which a muscle tissue elongate contains an edible filling disposed along the longitudinal axis thereof characterized in that said edible filling is comprised of an animal tissue elongate having a dominant proportion of water and protein respectively;

whereby a coaxially combined food item is produced which when sliced transversely will reveal a substantially concentric arrangement comprising an outer ring, a center, and a boundary thereinbetween, in which said boundary may or may not be highly visible depending on the visual similarity of the make up of the constituent elongates.

23. (previously presented) The food item of claim 22 in which said food item is sliced into steaks.

24. (previously presented) The food item of claim 22 which further includes a means for highlighting said boundary.

25. (previously presented) The food item of claim 24 in which said food item is sliced into steaks.

26. (previously presented) The food item of claim 22 wherein said muscle tissue elongate is comprised of a top loin.

27. (previously presented) The food item of claim 26 wherein said edible filling is comprised of a length of tenderloin.

28. (previously presented) The food item of claim 27 wherein said muscle tissue elongate is comprised of a length of longissimus dorsi.

29. (previously presented) The food item of claim 28 wherein said edible filling is comprised of a length of psoas major.

30. (previously presented) In a food item of the type in which a tubular perform comprised of a first animal tissue elongate contains an edible filling, characterized in that said edible filling is comprised of a second animal tissue elongate, said second animal tissue elongate having a weight of at least 7 percent of that of said first animal tissue elongate , whereby a coaxially combined food item is produced which when sliced transversely will reveal a substantially concentric arrangement comprising an outer ring, a center, and a boundary thereinbetween, in which said boundary may or may not be highly visible depending on the visual similarity of the make up of the constituent elongates.

31. (previously presented) In a food item of the type in which a first animal tissue elongate encases along the longitudinal axis thereof, an edible filling in which a boundary is disposed thereinbetween, the improvement comprising a means for highlighting the visual appearance of said boundary when said food item is sliced transversely thereacross allowing for the visual inspection thereof thereby.

32. (previously presented) The food item of claim 31 wherein said highlighting means is comprised of edible material of contrasting color to that of said first animal tissue elongate and said edible filling, said edible material being disposed coaxially between said edible filling and said first animal tissue elongate.

33. (previously presented) The food item of claim 32 wherein said edible material is comprised of green vegetable material.

34. (previously presented) The food item of claim 33 wherein said green vegetable material is comprised of leaf type vegetable material.

35. (previously presented) The food item of claim 30 wherein said second animal tissue elongate has a weight of at least 10 percent as that of said first animal tissue elongate.

36. (previously presented) The food item of claim 35 which further includes a means for highlighting said boundary.

37. (previously presented) The food item of claim 36 wherein said highlighting means is comprised of edible material of contrasting color to that of said first animal tissue elongate and that of said second animal tissue elongate, said edible material being coaxially disposed between said first animal tissue elongate and said second animal tissue elongate.

38. (previously presented) The food item of claim 37 wherein said edible material is comprised of green vegetable material.

39. (previously presented) The food item of claim 38 wherein said green vegetable material is comprised of leaf type vegetable material.

40. (previously presented) In a food item of the type in which a first muscle tissue elongate encases at least partially along the longitudinal axis thereof, an edible filling in which a boundary is disposed thereinbetween; characterized in that said edible filling is comprised of a second, non-pork muscle tissue elongate, said second non-pork muscle tissue elongate being of sufficiently small diameter to allow said second muscle tissue elongate to be longitudinally encased by said first muscle tissue elongate.

41. (previously presented) The food item of claim 40 which further includes a means for highlighting the visual appearance of said boundary when said food item is sliced transversely.

42. (previously presented) The food item of claim 41 wherein said first muscle tissue elongate is comprised of a first length of longissimus dorsi

and said second muscle tissue elongate is comprised of a second length of longissimus dorsi.

43. (previously presented) The food item of claim 41 wherein said first muscle tissue elongate is comprised of a first length of psoas major and said second muscle tissue elongate is comprised of a second length of psoas major.

44. (previously presented) In a food item of the type in which a muscle tissue elongate contains an edible filling disposed along the longitudinal axis thereof characterized in that said edible filling is comprised of a non-pork animal tissue elongate, whereby a coaxially combined food item is produced which when sliced transversely will reveal a substantially concentric arrangement comprising an outer ring, a center, and a boundary thereinbetween, in which said boundary may or may not be highly visible depending on the visual similarity of the make up of the constituent elongates.

45. (previously presented) The food item of claim 44 which further includes a means for highlighting said boundary.

46. (previously presented) The food item of claim 45 wherein said highlighting means is comprised of leaf type vegetable material, said leaf type vegetable material being coaxially disposed between said muscle tissue elongate and said non-pork animal tissue elongate.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX	N/A
-----------------------	-----

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX	N/A
---------------------------------	-----